

I am hopeful that by working together we can come up with an economic strategy which provides fiscal security by using any surplus pay down our publicly held debt and make Social Security and Medicare solvent, while also providing a tax relief package that helps working families. The bill before us today doesn't do this and I cannot support it. I hope our actions today will bring the House leadership to the table to design a measure that the President can sign into law.

IN HONOR OF PARMADALE'S 75TH
ANNIVERSARY

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of Parmadale's 75th anniversary. Over the years, this organization has continued to provide a vital caring service for deprived and needy children in the city of Parma. It has been an outstanding force in support of the family unit and provides an essential vision of social cohesion within our community for which we should all pay our respect.

Founded in September 1925, Parmadale was created with the objective of strengthening families by teaching parents how to more effectively care for their children. Throughout its years of community service, Parmadale's ethos has always been founded upon the strengths of family, neighborhood and community. As a care treatment provider it has maintained this fundamental value through services such as "Whole Family Treatment." It has also succeeded in adapting to the changing needs of children in our society.

Today it provides essential services for children suffering from drug dependence, mental difficulties, and serious emotional problems. The center prides itself on its flexible clinical response to the needs of children. The faculty provides specialized residential services, a range of foster care, as well as in-home services and day care. In 1989, the St. Augustine Center for Special Needs Children was established. This was the first Intensive Treatment Center for adolescents in the State of Ohio. In 1994, its success was conformed by the addition of a second Intensive Treatment Center.

My fellow colleagues please join me in paying respect to the outstanding work of the Parmadale Center. Its years of experience and flexible approach to care services ensure that it will continue to provide an invaluable service for the youth and general community of Parma, Ohio.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5179, THE
REGISTERED NURSES AND PA-
TIENTS PROTECTION ACT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today, with our colleague, the Gentleman from Massachusetts

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(Mr. MCGOVERN), I am introducing legislation that would restrict the ability of hospitals and other medical facilities to require registered nurses to work mandatory overtime hours as a normal course of business. Increasingly, employers, particularly in the health care field, are requiring employees to work overtime. Our legislation is H.R. 5179, the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

The Fair Labor Standards Act grants nurses the right to receive overtime compensation even though they are licensed professionals, but it does not limit the amount of overtime that nurses can work nor does it permit them to refuse mandatory overtime. In this era of full employment, it is simply easier and cheaper for hospital administrators to require existing employees to work overtime than it is for them to recruit and train new employees.

Mr. Speaker, no employer should be allowed to force an employee to work overtime or face termination unless there is an emergency situation that requires immediate emergency action. In the health care field, however, we are not just talking about an employee's right to refuse overtime work. We are also talking about patient safety. When nurses are forced to put in long overtime hours on a regular basis against their better judgment, it puts patients at risk.

The Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit mandatory overtime beyond 8 hours in a work day or 80 hours in any 14-day work period except in the case of a natural disaster or in the event of a declaration of an emergency by federal, state or local government officials. The legislation does not preclude a nurse from voluntarily working overtime.

Mr. Speaker, mandatory overtime for nurses is bad health care policy. A nurse shouldn't be on the job after the 15th or 16th consecutive hour especially after she has told her supervisor "I can't do this, I've been on the job too many hours today."

Nursing is physically and mentally demanding. When a nurse is tired, it is much more difficult to deliver quality, professional care to patients. Health care experts and common sense tell us that long hours take a toll on mental alertness and mandatory overtime under such conditions can result in serious medical mistakes—medication errors, transcription errors, and errors in judgment. By the end of a regular shift a nurse is exhausted. Increasingly, however, nurses are being forced to work 16, 18 or even 20 consecutive hours in hospitals across our nation.

Mr. Speaker, a nurse knows better than anyone—better than her supervisor and better than a hospital administrator—when she has reached the point of fatigue when continuing to work can result in serious medical problems. We must give nurses more power to decide if long hours on the job is making it difficult to perform their duties. This legislation is not a case of government micro-managing—this legislation gives nurses the power to say "NO" to the forced overtime practices of hospitals nationwide. We cannot continue to allow hospitals to force nurses to work so many hours that the health and safety of patients are put at risk. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the adoption of the Registered Nurses and Patients Protection Act.

September 14, 2000

FSC REPEAL AND EXTRA-TERRI-
TORIAL INCOME EXCLUSION ACT
OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 2000

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. It is problematic for a number of reasons. First, it does not address concerns laid out clearly in a letter to Deputy Secretary Eizenstat I signed in April along with 31 of my colleagues. I am attaching a copy of that letter.

In the wake of the WTO's adverse decision on Foreign Sales Corporations, we urged the Administration—as it fashioned its response to the WTO decision—to resist efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. After all, if the U.S. is serious about leading the world into a peaceful future, we should be promoting arms control—not increasing subsidies for defense contractors so that they can promote the conventional arms race. But this bill does just what we urged the Administration not to do—it would increase defense contractor subsidies.

In addition, this bill continues export subsidies for tobacco, thus making it American policy to promote the sales of cigarettes all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious issues deserving of serious debate. At a minimum, the bill should have been brought up under a rule for purposes of a thorough debate and consideration of amendments. This was especially necessary given the cost of the bill. At \$1.5 billion over five years (in addition to the revenue that would be lost under FSC), this bill should have been more thoroughly discussed before being put to a vote.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support H.R. 4986 as it has been brought before the House.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 19, 2000.

Hon. STUART E. EIZENSTAT,
Deputy Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY EIZENSTAT: In your position as the lead Administration official charged with implementing an acceptable response to the adverse World Trade Organization (WTO) decision on Foreign Sales Corporations (FSC), we urge you to resist all efforts to increase benefits for military arms sales. Indeed, the existing benefits should actually be narrowed.

The current limitation on this benefit, as contained in 26 USC §923(a)(5), provides that the normal FSC benefit is reduced by 50% for sales of certain military property, defined by Treasury as, "an arm, ammunition, or implement of war." Specific covered military property is listed on the U.S. Munitions List (22 CFR 121), as provided for by the Arms Export Control Act (22 USC §2778).

Firmly believing that our nation should be providing more leadership for effective arms control policies, we seek your help to avoid additional subsidies with federal taxpayer monies to promote the conventional arms races that plague our planet. We should be promoting arms control, not arms sales.

The complicated legislative history of the FSC provision does show that it was intended to help U.S. companies to compete